

The Model's Opening Week Programme

Wednesday=Men's Suits

Yesterday we showed to many thousands the newness, vastness and completeness of this store and stock. To-day we will demonstrate **HOW** this store saves money for the clothing buyers of every class.

First we will tell you of our Men's Suits. Over 10,000 of them are piled on our tables here. There are suits for men in every walk of life—for the business man, the professional man, the clerk, mechanic or laborer. Suits for men who can afford the best and for those who must make fewer dollars clothe them. Suits for every fancy and for every purse. America's foremost tailors are represented in this stock. Every suit is absolutely correct in style, every piece of goods is of this season's weaving. Every detail of tailoring is above criticism.

We have Men's Suits at \$7.50, \$9.75, \$11.50, \$13.50, \$15, \$18, \$20, \$22.50, \$25, \$27.50 and \$33. These prices are \$3 to \$10 below what other stores are getting for identical values, and comparison will prove it. In our finer suits at \$25 and \$30 we can satisfy men who think they must have their clothing made to order in order to get it right.

As an opening week offer we have for to-day (Wednesday) 350 Men's Strictly **ALL-WOOL** Cassimere Suits, in three dark patterns, made up by union labor, sewed with silk, 4-button round cut sack style, coat with double warp Italian lining, front interlined with hair cloth, and with first-class trimmings throughout. Such suits retail in St. Louis to-day for \$10. There are 350 of them here and the price is **\$5.75**.

To-morrow we will have something else to tell you about this store. It will be interesting reading.

The Model

"Your Money's Worth or Money Back."

Seventh and Washington Ave.

It Is Worth Its Weight in Coal.


Gas Will Heat Your Room

FOR ONE AND ONE-HALF A CENT AN HOUR
WHEN USED IN THE
NEW, ODORLESS, SCIENTIFIC
Stamford Gas Heater.

BACKUS BUILDING,
1011 OLIVE.

Headquarters for Good Gas Goods.

Makes a Little Gas Bill, But a Big Heat



Ornamental, But Oh, How Useful!

CROW MOVES TO QUASH PROCEEDINGS.

Question of Taxing Corporations at Their Full Value Before Supreme Court.

ST. LOUIS REPUBLICAN MIDDLE

Attorney Gilliam Files Petition Stating That Election Commissioners Are in Contempt—Detailed Proceedings.

REPUBLICAN SPECIAL.
Jefferson City, Mo., Oct. 14.—Attorney General Crow appeared before the Supreme Court, which convened today for the first time, and filed a petition to quash the proceedings of the Board of Equalization against the State of Missouri.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

The application was made several days ago by Mr. Hill of St. Louis, who claimed that the board had acted without authority and was acting in violation of the constitution.

er name already filed. The Socialist could not get their ticket filed under their own name. The defense was represented by Attorney Brown of St. Louis. The court took the matter under advisement, and will probably announce a decision Wednesday, as Thursday is the day of the election. The Socialist party is now in a predicament, as the Secretary of State to certify out to the County Clerk the different tickets.

Attorney Zischel, who made today's application to the Supreme Court in banc, a temporary rule in prohibition to prevent the St. Louis election. Commissioners from putting the name of F. A. Cline on the Republican ticket in St. Louis, as a nominee for Justice of the Peace. The application was made at the instance of John Hyde of St. Louis, who was defeated for the nomination.

FEELING-SERVANT CASE.
The court affirmed a decision of the lower court, giving John M. Hyde, verdict for damages against the Missouri Pacific Railway Company for \$1000. The plaintiff was injured by receiving a basket, which was thrown in a freight car on the Missouri Pacific from St. Louis to Colorado. The accident happened at Tipton, Mo. A freight engine backed into the train with such force as to throw the basket into the car and fell a cow on top of him. Hyde was riding in a car of household goods, in which he had some personal property.

The court affirmed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

The court reversed the lower court in the case of Mary P. Smith of St. Louis against the Mutual Benefit Life Assurance Society for \$2500. The plaintiff's husband died in 1901, and the company refused to pay the claim on the ground that the policy had been assigned to a third party and had then been lapsed. The contention was that the policy was assigned to the plaintiff, and the lower court, but the decision was reversed today, and a verdict rendered against the company for an amount of \$2500.

MONEY SET ASIDE FOR THE EXPOSITION.

Directors Appropriate \$2,500,000 Additional for Grounds and Buildings.

ONE MILLION FOR RENTALS.

Ways and Means Committee to Take Up Hotel Problem—Exposition Chiefs Talk of Their Work.

Directors of division, chiefs of departments and heads of the various structural departments, for grounds and buildings, met last night at the St. Louis Club and rendered account of their work.

The Exposition corps was afterwards the guests of the board at a collation, served in the banquet chamber. This was the first occasion on which the Directors of the Exposition met personally the workers who are making the Fair.

Additional appropriations were approved, to be set aside for the use of the various departments. For grounds and buildings, \$2,500,000 was added to the original \$3,000,000 devoted to the important work. For the Exposition, \$2,500,000, and public buildings, \$1,000,000.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.

The Division of Exhibits was accorded \$2,000,000 and the Division of Construction and Administration \$2,500,000. For the administration of the offices of President, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, Medical Director, Jefferson Board, and the various departments, \$1,000,000 was appropriated.



Miss Gannon, Sec'y Detroit Amateur Art Association, tells young women what to do to avoid pain and suffering caused by female troubles.

"I can heartily recommend Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound to those of my sisters suffering with female weakness and the troubles which so often befall women. I suffered for months with general weakness and felt so weary that I had hard work to keep up. I had shooting pains and was utterly miserable. In my distress I was advised to use Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound, and it was a red letter day to me when I took the first dose, for at that time my restoration began. In six weeks I was a changed woman, perfectly well in every respect. I felt so elated and happy that I want all women who suffer to get well as I did."

Miss GANNON, 309 Jones St., Detroit, Corresponding Sec'y, Michigan Amateur Art Association. —\$5000 forfeit if original of above letter proving genuineness cannot be produced.

It is clearly shown in this young lady's letter that Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound will surely cure the sufferings of women; and when one considers that Miss Gannon's letter is only one of hundreds which we have, the great virtue of Mrs. Pinkham's medicine must be admitted by all.

will demand the services of another engineer. Mr. Greene was a member of the firm of Foster & Greene of New York, structural engineers, and of the firm of Greene & Wadsworth of New York. He is a graduate of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Troy, N. Y. He has been a draftsman and engineer for many large construction companies, and had charge of the iron work for the greenhouses of the Vanderbilt country manor at Biltmore, N. C.

will demand the services of another engineer. Mr. Greene was a member of the firm of Foster & Greene of New York, structural engineers, and of the firm of Greene & Wadsworth of New York. He is a graduate of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Troy, N. Y. He has been a draftsman and engineer for many large construction companies, and had charge of the iron work for the greenhouses of the Vanderbilt country manor at Biltmore, N. C.

will demand the services of another engineer. Mr. Greene was a member of the firm of Foster & Greene of New York, structural engineers, and of the firm of Greene & Wadsworth of New York. He is a graduate of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Troy, N. Y. He has been a draftsman and engineer for many large construction companies, and had charge of the iron work for the greenhouses of the Vanderbilt country manor at Biltmore, N. C.

will demand the services of another engineer. Mr. Greene was a member of the firm of Foster & Greene of New York, structural engineers, and of the firm of Greene & Wadsworth of New York. He is a graduate of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Troy, N. Y. He has been a draftsman and engineer for many large construction companies, and had charge of the iron work for the greenhouses of the Vanderbilt country manor at Biltmore, N. C.

will demand the services of another engineer. Mr. Greene was a member of the firm of Foster & Greene of New York, structural engineers, and of the firm of Greene & Wadsworth of New York. He is a graduate of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Troy, N. Y. He has been a draftsman and engineer for many large construction companies, and had charge of the iron work for the greenhouses of the Vanderbilt country manor at Biltmore, N. C.

will demand the services of another engineer. Mr. Greene was a member of the firm of Foster & Greene of New York, structural engineers, and of the firm of Greene & Wadsworth of New York. He is a graduate of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Troy, N. Y. He has been a draftsman and engineer for many large construction companies, and had charge of the iron work for the greenhouses of the Vanderbilt